FILE COPY

Office - Supreme Court, U.
FILED
MAY 13 1948
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October 1947 Term

NUMBER 727

DINSHAH P. GHADIALI
and
DINSHAH SPECTRO-CHROME INSTITUTE
Petitioners

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Respondent

REPLY TO BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

DINSHAH P. GHADIALI,
Malaga, New Jersey
pro se et al.

Printed In The United States Of America

IN THE
SUPREME COURT
OF THE
UNITED STATES

October 1947 Term

NUMBER 727

DINSHAH P. GHADIALI
and
DINSHAH SPECTRO-CHROME INSTITUTE
Petitioners

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Respondent

REPLY TO BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

TO

The Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

May It Please Your Honors:

Now comes before you DINSHAH P. GHADIALI, for self and Co:Petitioner and most respectfully presents this short REPLY TO BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION.

The Respondent presented no argument in support of its Opposition, that would affect the grant of the WRIT OF CERTIORARI; instead it made many untruthful and evasive statements.

On Page 6 of its Brief, the Respondent mentions that "petitioners do not challenge the sufficiency of the evidence." On the contrary, the Petition for the Writ is a complete challenge to the entire mode of Trial.

Further, on Page 6, the Respondent states that "Ghadiali and his personally dominated corporation profited handsomely from the sale of their devices." This is utterly untrue. The Transcript Of Record clearly shows by the Income Tax Reports, (Defendants' Exhibits 480 a-b-c, in Evidence.) that the Royalty on his numerous Patents and Copyrights as well as life-long services, netted him a mere living wage. The Corporation was and still is under heavy debt. Furthermore, there was no "SALE", the Device being a Gift for Personal Benefit to the Affiliate of the Corporation. (Defendants' Exhibits 2, 8, 17, 20, 33, 378, 383, 402 in Evidence.)

Points of Pages 7, 8 and 9 are argued by the Petitioners in their Brief, in their Questions 2 and 3.

Points of Pages 10 and 11 are fully argued by the Petitioners, in their Questions 4 and 5. The eventual views expressed by the Trial Judge, were at variance with his first promise, that he would permit experimental demonstrations. This prejudiced the Petitioners most adversely. Question 6 of the Petitioners clearly enunciates this in its Argument.

"SOME CLOSING REMARKS" on Pages 92, 93, 94, 95, are solely a few instances of the unethical and undignified conduct of the Assistant U. S. Attorney Grover C. Richman, jr., whose OPEN PERJURY in the Trial Court, when on the Stand as a Defense Witness, the Respondent conveniently "forgot" to explain in the Opposition Brief. The Transcript Of Record is full of many more such instances. The Petitioners did not call for a Mistrial, out of respect to the Honorable Trial Judge. (Tr. C-927, Tr. I-3795).

About the untenable Probation Terms, which the Respondent asserts as "milder sanction" in its Opposition Brief at Page 13, the Petitioners draw the Honorable Supreme Court's attention to the Argument in the Petitioners' Brief, Pages 86 to 92, both inclusive.

CONCLUSION

The Petitioners repeat their humble Prayer for the gracious grant of the Writ Of Certiorari.

Most Respectfully Submitted,

DINSHAH P. GHADIALI,
pro se et al.

Dated:—Thursday, May 13, 1948
Malaga, New Jersey.

MEMORANDA